

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The present amendment is in response to the final Office Action mailed July 1, 2003, in which Claims 1 through 9, 11, 12 and 27 through 32 were rejected. Applicants have thoroughly reviewed the outstanding Office Action including the Examiner's remarks and the reference cited therein. The following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action and, when coupled with the amendments made herein, are believed to render all claims at issue patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Applicants have respectfully noticed that the Examiner indicted in the Response to Arguments section that the features upon which Applicants rely are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Accordingly, Claims 7 and 27 are amended to particularly point out the following features: (1) The thickness of the molding compound (means) on the center portion is thinner than on the periphery of the chip and (2) the molding compound exists between the chip and the heat slug (heat-spreading device). The above amendment and following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action and render all claims at issue patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Claims 7 and 27 have also been amended to correct the informalities for overcoming claim objects, wherein "head spreading" is to changed to "heat-spreading".

All the changes are made for clarification and are based on the application and drawings as originally filed. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. SECTION 103(a)

Claims 7-9, 11, 12 and 27-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,146,921 to Barrow (hereinafter referred to as "Barrow"). These rejections are respectfully traversed. As will be fully explained below, it is respectfully submitted that Barrow does not teach the claimed invention, and the applicants respectfully request that the Section 103(a) rejections be withdrawn.

The Examiner stated that Barrow discloses the semiconductor packages recited in Claims 7 and 27 of the claimed invention. However, such as shown in Fig. 1 and column 2 lines 38-48, Barrow teaches that the thermal element 26 (heat spreading device) may contacts the integrated circuit 12 (die) directly, or via a thermally conductive epoxy or grease, i.e., no housing 22 (molding compound) exists between the thermal element 26 and the integrated circuit 12. Moreover, in column 1 lines 41-44, Barrow suggests that it would be desirable to provide a package and a process that

would eliminate the formation of plastic between the thermal element and the integrated circuit.

In contrast, in the semiconductor packages recited in Claims 7 and 27 of the claimed invention, there is molding compound (means) existing between the heat-spreading device (means) and the die, thereby preventing the integrated circuit from rubbing against the thermal element caused by the different thermal expansion coefficients.

Accordingly, Barrow fails to disclose or suggest the structures of the semiconductor packages recited in Claims 7 and 27 of the claimed invention.

Regarding to Claims 8, 9, 11 and 12, since Claim 7 is believed to be allowable, dependent Claims 8, 9, 11 and 12 each of which depends from independent Claim 7 are likewise believed to be allowable. Regarding Claims 28 through 32, since Claim 27 is believed to be allowable, dependent Claims 28 through 32 each of which depends from independent Claim 27 are likewise believed to be allowable.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that the Section 103(a) rejections be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims as currently presented are in

condition for allowance. If, for any reason, the Examiner disagrees, please call the undersigned attorney at 248-433-7552 in an effort to resolve any matter still outstanding *before* issuing another action. The undersigned attorney is confident that any issue which might remain can readily be worked out by telephone.

Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas T. Moga
Registration No. 34,881
Attorney for Applicants

DICKINSON WRIGHT PLLC
1901 L Street, N.W., Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20036
202-457-0160

Dated: **October 31**, 2003

TTM/hs